

Applicants: Mark Ledebuer et al.  
Application No.: 10/005,133

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 03 2006

### REMARKS

#### The Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended claims 1-3 to delete the recitation of "hydrogen" for variable R<sup>1</sup> and have further amended claim 1 to delete the recitation of "hydrogen" for variable R<sup>3</sup>.

None of these amendments adds new matter. Their entry is requested.

Applicants reserve the right to pursue the canceled subject matter in this application or in future continuing or divisional applications.

#### The Response

##### *The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph*

The Examiner states that claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that claims 4 and 5 lack antecedent basis because R<sup>1</sup> can be cyclohexyl, which is not encompassed by T<sub>(n)</sub>-Ar<sup>1</sup> in claim 1. Similarly, the Examiner states that claim 6 lacks antecedent basis because it recites species wherein R<sup>1</sup> is a cyclohexyl group. Applicants traverse.

Claim 1 recites that R<sup>1</sup> can be T<sub>(n)</sub>-R, wherein R is an aliphatic or substituted aliphatic group. The specification clearly states that an aliphatic group includes cyclic C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>12</sub> hydrocarbons. See page 9, lines 9-13 of the specification. Thus, originally-filed claim 1 encompassed cyclic aliphatic groups such as cyclohexyl.

##### *Double Patenting*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 17, 20 and 21 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5 and 12 of United States Patent 6,884,804 B2.

Applicants stand ready to provide a terminal disclaimer upon notice of allowable subject matter.

##### *The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,514,977 B1 (hereafter the '977 patent).

Applicants: Mark Ledebner et al.  
Application No.: 10/005,133

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over WO 98/52940 (hereafter the '940 application). Specifically, the Examiner states that Scheme C-11 of the '977 patent and Scheme C-4 of the '940 application describe a process for making a 2-substituted pyrimidinylpyrazole wherein R<sup>1</sup> is hydrogen; R<sup>2</sup> is R, which is an aliphatic group substituted with NH<sub>2</sub> or R is -CH<sub>2</sub>NH<sub>2</sub>; G is hydrogen or alkyl; and R<sup>3</sup> is hydrogen.

As amended, neither R<sup>1</sup> nor R<sup>3</sup> can be hydrogen in the instantly-claimed genus. Neither the '977 patent nor the '940 application teach or suggest compounds in which R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>3</sup> are other than hydrogen, thus obviating this rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicants request that the Examiner enter the above amendments, consider the accompanying arguments, and allow the claims to pass to issue. Should the Examiner deem expedient a telephone discussion to further the prosecution of the above application, applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at his convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Karen E. Brown  
Reg. No. 43,866  
Attorney for Applicants  
c/o Vertex Pharmaceuticals Incorporated  
130 Waverly Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139  
Tel: (617) 444-6168  
Fax: (617) 444-6483